UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,718	11/30/2001	Won Uk Yu	P-0303	3711

34610 7590 03/03/2009

KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP
P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200

EXAMINER	
CHANKONG, DOHM	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2452	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/996,718	YU, WON UK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DOHM CHANKONG	2452	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 December 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16, 18-20, and 22-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16, 18-20, and 22-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Applicant's arguments filed on 12/8/2008. No claims are amended. Claims 1-16, 18-20, and 22-27 are presented for further examination.

2. This action is a final rejection.

Response to Arguments

3. With respect to the rejection of claim 1 under He, Applicant argues that He does not disclose the limitation "storing the new authentication number in a memory device of the Internet TV for use during a later session." Applicant argues that He teaches that his general ticket (compared to the claimed authentication number) is deleted after a user logs off and must log back on again to obtain a new ticket. Applicant's argument is not persuasive for two reasons. First, the limitation of "for use during a later session" is not given patentable weight. And second, Applicant's argument is premised entirely on the assumption that He's user log-on session contains only a single session with a network device.

As to the first reason, Applicant is reminded that "claim scope is not limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed." *MPEP 2111.04.* One illustration of this principle is when a "whereby clause in a method claim is not given weight when it simply expresses the intended result of a process step positively recited." *Id.* Here, the claim language "for use during a later session" does not limit the claim's scope because it *merely makes optional* the step of using the authentication number for a later session and simply expresses the *intended result* of storing the authentication number. So as long as a

reference simply teaches storing the authentication number in a memory device, it meets the claim. In order to avoid this interpretation, Applicant needs to amend the claim to include an actual method step where the authentication number is *actually being used in a later session*.

As to the second reason, He discloses that once a general ticket has been issued to a user, the user can establish different sessions with different network elements using the same general ticket [column 2 «lines 36-47» : a general ticket is used to "facilitate future access requests" and the general ticket is used "each time the user element initiates a communication session" (emphasis added)]. That is, each time a user requests a communication session with a network element, the server first checks the general ticket before issuing a separate session ticket that the user uses to connect to a particular network element [Figure 7]. Thus, a user can establish multiple sessions with different elements during single log-on. Applicant's independent claims merely require that the authentication is stored for use during a later session. He teaches this limitation. As discussed above, He teaches a user requests a "later" session with a network element after the general ticket (authentication number) has been issued in response to a previous session with a different network element.

Further with respect to claim 1, Applicant repeats the argument that Bonnaure fails to disclose an Internet TV. While acknowledging that Bonnaure discloses a TV containing an ISDN modem, Applicant argues that this does not read on Applicant's claimed Internet TV. Applicant's specification defines an internet TV as device where "modem apparatuses such as a cable modem, a local area network (LAN), an asymmetric digital subscriber line (ADSL) modem, and a telephone line modem are loaded" into the television [pg. 1, ll. 22-25]. Bonnaure's television and interface device clearly meet this definition because Bonnaure

discloses a television with the cable modem integrated, or "loaded" into the television [Figure 3 column 4 «lines 8-10»: "the network interface device as an integrated unit built into a television set"].

4. With respect to the rejection of claim 1 under Bonnaure, Applicant also argues that Bonnaure fails to disclose the limitation of storing the new authentication in a memory device of the Internet TV for use during a later session. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because as discussed above, the limitation is not given patentable weight because it merely expresses the intended result of storing the authentication number. Moreover, Bonnaure discloses the limitation as claimed. Bonnaure discloses storing the authentication number in the memory device of the Internet TV [column 4 «lines 8-10»: network interface built into the TV | Fig. 8: network interface with memory device storing authentication numbers]. Either Bonnaure's client box identifier or the client's network address may read on the claimed authentication number because Bonnaure discloses that either may be used to authenticate the client device [column 8 «lines 44-47»: "Client authentication data 1010 represents information indicating a client network address and a client box identifier"].

5. Because none of Applicant's arguments are found persuasive, the rejections set forth in the previous action are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 21, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over He et al, U.S Patent No. 6.088.451 ["He"], in view of Bonnaure et al, U.S Patent No. 5.862.339 ["Bonnaure"], in further view of Eide et al, U.S. Patent No. 6.820.157 ["Eide"].

7. As to claim 1, He discloses a method for accessing the Internet, comprising:

transmitting a message from the Internet device to the server requesting authentication for use of information during a current session [Figure 6];

transmitting a message from the server requesting an authentication number from the Internet device [column 2 «lines 36-47» where He's general ticket is analogous to an authentication number];

transmitting the requested authentication number from the Internet device to the server if the authentication number is available [column 2 «lines 37-39»], checking a validity of the transmitted authentication number [column 2 «lines 42-46»], and providing information to the Internet device for the current session if it is determined that the authentication number is valid [column 2 «lines 42-47»];

requesting a new authentication number from the server if the authentication number is not available [column 17 «lines 61-67»], registering a user in accordance with information collected by the server [column 8 «lines 21-29»], receiving a new authentication number from the server [column 27 «lines 23-24»], and providing information to the Internet device for use during the current session [column 27 «lines 40-56»]; and

storing the new authentication number in a memory device of the Internet TV for use during a later session [column 2 «lines 36-46» : storing the general ticket is implied by the fact that it is used for future requests].

He does not disclose an Internet TV nor does He disclose that the authentication number (He's general ticket) is a combination of at least one of a model name, a manufacturing year, or a manufacturing month of the internet TV.

However, He discloses that his invention is for providing a security system for user access to network elements. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that He's system would be compatible with any internet device, such as an Internet TV and as taught by Bonnaure [Figure 5].

Additionally, the authentication number feature was well known in the art at the time of Applicant's invention. It is noted that Eide is not expressly directed towards identifying an Internet TV. However, Eide does disclose the well known principle that various devices can be uniquely identified through a combination of identifiers such as a hardware device's model name or the device's manufacturing date [column 12 «lines 36-42»]. Utilizing identifiers in a manner taught by Eide is applicable across a wide variety of applications including identifying network devices.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have applied Eide's identification features to He and Bonnaure's system to uniquely identify the network element. Eide teaches that it was well known in the art to have combined these identifies to uniquely identify devices. Thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify He's general ticket to include a combination of the model name and manufacturing date as taught by Eide to create a unique identifier.

8. As to claims 2 and 7, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth for claim 1. Additionally, He discloses determining an authentication number based on additional information collected by the portal server [column 27 «lines 23-29» where : the ticket is generated based on verification of the user ID and password].

9. As to claim 4, He further discloses:

if the authentication number is not available, requesting the portal server to provide a new authentication number with respect to the use of information [column 17 «lines 61-67»]; and

receiving a new authentication number from the portal server and storing the authentication number in a memory device [column 17 «lines 61-67» : storing the number is implied by the fact that it is used for subsequent requests].

10. As to claim 5, He discloses:

examining the authentication number [column 27 «lines 44-47»];

receiving information from the portal server when it is determined from the

examination of the authentication number that the authentication is a normal authentication number [column 27 «lines 44-56»].

11. As to claims 9 and 10, see the rejection of claims 1 and 2.

12. As to claims 25-27, He does not disclose that the authentication number (He's general ticket) is a combination of at least two of a model name, a manufacturing year, or a manufacturing month of the internet TV. However, as discussed above, with respect to claim 1, Eide discloses that an authentication number for a device may comprise a combination of identifiers including the model name and date.

13. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 14, 15, 20, and 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonnaure in view of Nobakht et al, U.S. Patent No. 6.785.716 ["Nobakht"].

14. Nobakht was cited in the PTO-892 filed on 7/28/2005.

15. As to claim 1, Bonnaure discloses a method for accessing the internet using an internet TV in an internet TV system comprising the internet TV, in which a function of accessing the internet and a function of receiving a TV broadcast are combined, and a server for operating a portal site which provides information to the internet TV [Figure 2 | Figure 7], the method comprising:

transmitting a message from the internet TV to the server requesting authentication

for use of information during a current session [Figure 13 «item 1310»];

transmitting a message from the server requesting an authentication number from the Internet TV [Figure 13 «item 1311» | Figure 15 «item 1510» : the WebTV server requesting an encryption key from the client];

transmitting the requested authentication number from the Internet TV to the server if the authentication number is available [Figure 8 «item 844» | column 10 «lines 53-57»], checking a validity of the transmitted authentication number [Figure 11 «items 1120» where : Bonnaure does not expressly disclose checking the validity of the encryption key; however, such a feature is implied because the server and client establish a connection through the encryption key; if the client provides an incorrect key, then connections will not be established], and providing information to the Internet TV for the current session if it is determined that the authentication number is valid [column 9 «lines 23-26» : subsequent data communications];

requesting a new authentication number from the server if the authentication number is not available [Figure 12 «item 1210»], registering a user in accordance with information collected by the server [Figure 12 «item 1212, 1214» | column 4 «lines 55-60» | column 8 «lines 44-54»], receiving a new authentication number from the server [column 7 «lines 24-42»], and providing information to the Internet TV for use during the current session [column 9 «lines 23-26»]; and

storing the new authentication number in a memory device of the Internet TV for use during a later session [column 7 «lines 24-42»].

Bonnaure does not expressly disclose that the authentication number is a combination of at least one of a model name, a manufacturing year, or a manufacturing month of the internet

TV. However, such a feature was well known in the art at the time of Applicant's invention. For example, Nobakht discloses an authentication number that comprises a combination of at least one of a manufacturing year or a month for an Internet TV [Figure 3C «item 343»] where this number is useful for uniquely identifying the Internet TV during communications with the server [column 7 «lines 21-24» | column 12 «lines 45-58»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented Bonnaure's authentication number as a manufacturing date of the Internet TV as taught by Nobahkt. One would have been motivated to have modified Bonnaure in order to provide a unique identifier for the Internet TV for correlating user account information with the Internet TV.

16. As to claim 2, Bonnaure discloses a method for accessing the Internet using an Internet TV, comprising:

transmitting a message requesting authentication for use of information to a portal server and transmitting a response from the portal server requesting transmission of an authentication number when the Internet TV is turned on [Figure 13 «items 1310, 1311» | Figure 15 «item 1510»];

determining if the authentication number requested by the portal server is available and transmitting the authentication number to the portal server if the authentication number is already available, and determining an authentication number based on additional information collected by the portal server and transmitting the authentication number to the Internet TV for storage if the authentication number is not already available [Figure 8 «item 844» | Figure 11 «item 1120» |

Figure 12 «items 1210, 1212» : generating an encryption key based on whether the client network address and identifiers are valid | column 10 «lines 53-57»];

transmitting information related to the message requesting authentication for use of information from the portal server to the Internet TV [column 9 «lines 23-26»].

Bonnaure does not expressly disclose that the authentication number is a combination of at least one of a model name, a manufacturing year, or a manufacturing month of the internet TV. However, such a feature was well known in the art at the time of Applicant's invention. For example, Nobakht discloses an authentication number that comprises a combination of at least one of a manufacturing year or a month for an Internet TV [Figure 3C «item 343»] where this number is useful for uniquely identifying the Internet TV during communications with the server [column 7 «lines 21-24» | column 12 «lines 45-58»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented Bonnaure's authentication number as a manufacturing date of the Internet TV as taught by Nobahkt. One would have been motivated to have modified Bonnaure in order to provide a unique identifier for the Internet TV for correlating user account information with the Internet TV.

17. As to claims 3 and 20, Bonnaure further discloses:

determining if the Internet TV is in a default state [column 12 «lines 5-16» : initial activation of the client box];

requesting the portal server to search for an authentication number corresponding to the Internet TV when the Internet TV is in a default state [Figure 12 «item 1214»];

inputting user information requested by the portal server [Figure 12 «item 1212»]; and

receiving the requested authentication number an storing the received number in a memory device [Figure 11 «item 1112»].

18. As to claim 4, Bonnaure further discloses:

if the authentication number is not available, requesting the portal server to provide a new authentication number with respect to the use of information [Figure 12 «item 1210»]; and

receiving a new authentication number from the portal server and storing the authentication number in a memory device [Figure 12 «item 1214»].

19. As to claim 7, as it does not teach or further define over the limitations of claims 1 and 2, claim 7 is similarly rejected for at least the same reasons set forth above.

20. As to claim 8, Bonnaure discloses the portal server is in a stand-by state waiting for an access request message [Figure 12 «item 1210»].

21. As to claim 9, Bonnaure further discloses:

requesting the Internet TV to provide user information when the received access request message requests the portal server to search for an authentication number [column 7 «lines 16-23 and 43-56»];

determining whether a user is registered in a database when the user information is received and transmitting an authentication number if the user is registered [column 7 «lines 16-

23 and 43-56» | column 11 «lines 48-59» : transmission of the encryption key if the user has an account or has registered the device's box number].

22. As to claim 10, Bonnaure discloses assigning a new authentication number to the Internet TV when the user information is received and transmitting the assigned authentication number to the Internet TV [column 1 «lines 40-51» : establishing and registering an account | column 4 «lines 49-60»]. Bonnaure does not expressly disclose requesting for the user information when it is determined that the user is not registered. However, this feature is well known in the art and implied by Bonnaure's disclosure that user's must first establish accounts with the server for being granted access to internet services. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have reasonably inferred that Bonnaure's system had a means for requesting user information in order to establish the user accounts.

23. As to claim 14, Bonnaure discloses registering the user in the database and providing information to the Internet TV when the user information is received [column 1 «lines 40-51» : establishing and registering an account | column 4 «lines 49-60»].

24. As to claim 15, Bonnaure does not disclose determining whether a user fee is paid and transmitting a message to the user saying so. However, Nobakht discloses the feature whereby determining a user fee is paid and transmitting a message that the user fee is not paid if it is determined that the user fee is not paid [Nobakht, Col.12, lines 59-66]. This feature is well known in the ecommerce arts to keep subscribers up to date with their account information. It

would have been obvious to anyone of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated these accounting features into Bonnaure to better enable service providers to inform their customers of delinquent accounts.

25. As to claim 22, Bonnaure does not disclose a user registration form to register the users. However, user registration forms in an ecommerce/internet environment are ubiquitous throughout the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have reasonably inferred the user of such a form to establish a user account and register the user.

26. As to claim 23, Bonnaure discloses the authentication number is accessed from a memory device of the Internet TV [Figure 8 «item 844»].

27. As to claim 24, Bonnaure discloses accessing the stored authentication number to gain access to the Internet [Figure 8 «item 844»].

28. As to claims 25-27, Bonnaure does not disclose that the authentication number is a combination of at least two of the manufacturing year or the manufacturing month of the Internet TV. However, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Nobahkt discloses an authentication number comprising of a combination of the manufacturing year and month [column 7 «lines 21-24» | column 12 «lines 45-58»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have reasonably inferred that a "manufacturing date" comprised both the year and the month.

29. Claims 5, 6, 11-13, 18, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonnaure, in view of Dorfman et al, U.S Patent No. 6.449.651 ["Dorfman"].

30. As to claim 5, Bonnaure does disclose receiving information from the portal server when it is determined from the examination of the authentication number that the authentication number is a normal authentication number [column 9 «lines 23-26» : receiving information only if the encryption key is correct] but does not expressly disclose examining the authentication number. This step is implied from the fact that if the encryption key is incorrect then subsequent communications of data will not be successful.

Additionally, Dorfman discloses checking the validity of encryption keys by examining them [column 3 «lines 1-6»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have reasonably inferred that Bonnaure included the examination step in order to insure that the encryption key was valid.

31. As to claim 6, Bonnaure as modified discloses:

providing user information requested by the portal server when it is determined from the examination of the authentication number that the authentication number is not a normal authentication number [column 7 «lines 16-23 and 43-56»];

receiving an authentication number from the portal server and storing the received authentication number in a memory device [column 7 «lines 16-23 and 43-56» | column 11 «lines 48-59»].

32. As to claim 11, Bonnaure and Dorfman discloses checking for an error in the authentication number [see rejection of claim 5], determining whether the user is registered in a database when an error is not detected [column 1 «lines 40-51» | column 7 «lines 43-56»], and providing information to the Internet TV when it is determined that the user is registered in the database. However, they do not disclose providing the information according to whether a user fee is paid.

The feature of providing services based on a paid fee is ubiquitous in the art. It is not only well known but expected in all areas of ecommerce. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have reasonably inferred that the services provided by Bonnaure's service providers hinged upon whether users paid their fees.

33. As to claim 12, Bonnaure and Dorfman do not disclose using checksums to check the validity of the key. However, using checksums to check for errors is almost as ubiquitous as paying fees for a service. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used the checksum functionality to determine the validity of encryption keys to insure they are not corrupted.

34. As to claim 13, Bonnaure as amended discloses transmitting an error message when an error is detected in the authentication number [Figure 13 «item 1318»], requesting the Internet TV to provide user information and determining whether the user is registered in the database and transmitting a corresponding authentication number when it is determined that the user is registered [see rejection of claim 11]

35. As to claims 18 and 19, as they do not teach or further define over the limitations of claims 5, 6 and 11-13, claims 18 and 19 are similarly rejected for at least the same reasons above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOHM CHANKONG whose telephone number is (571)272-3942. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday [8:30 AM to 4:30 PM].

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571.272.3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dohm Chankong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452